



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,208	08/18/2000	Loc X. Phan	AT00085	7275

20350 7590 07/17/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

LUCCHESI, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3732	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/641,208</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Phan</b>
	Examiner <b>Nick Lucchesi</b>	Art Unit <b>3732</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) 19-38 is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3303

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chishti et al in view of Morrow et al.

Chishti et al disclose first, intermediate and final tooth positioning appliances 100 similar to that as claimed by applicant in these claims, as well as a method of repositioning teeth from an initial arrangement, to a final arrangement. Note that the appliances are polymeric shells, essentially the same as that claimed by applicant.

Chishti et al do not disclose coating the polymeric shells with a lubricious composition.

Morrow et al disclose coating a polymeric mouthpiece with a lubricious composition, to increase the comfort to the wearer.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to coat the polymeric shells of Chishti et al with a lubricious composition, as taught by Morrow et al, in view of the Morrow et al teaching that such a composition applied to a mouthpiece allows for greater comfort to the wearer.

Art Unit: 3303

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 19-38 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant bases arguments upon the assertion that it would not have been obvious to coat the mouthpieces of Chishti et al with a lubricious composition, because the mouthpieces of Chishti et al are used for moving teeth and thus would not work effectively.

It is the examiner's position that the teaching of Morrow et al is to increase the comfort of the wearer of such a mouthpiece, by applying such a lubricious composition. Thus, one skilled in the art would recognize that such a composition could be applied to the exterior or the interior of the Chishti et al mouthpieces, if one wished to increase comfort while wearing them. The mouthpieces of Chishti et al would still be capable of moving teeth, as they fit rather snugly.

Art Unit: 3303

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nick Lucchesi whose telephone number is (703) 308-2698.



NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 3300

  
Nick Lucchesi

July 12, 2002